



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A knowledge of Don Quijote, of the plays of Calderon or of the novels of Galdos will go much farther toward making a man popular in South America than the ability to talk with more or less fluent inaccuracy, in Spanish, on subjects connected with his own line of business. In short, if our young men expect to do business in any country, they must learn to understand and appreciate the outlook upon life of the people with whom they wish to establish relations, commercial or other.

It has long been recognized, even by beginners, that to the student of French some knowledge of Latin is very helpful in gaining an acquaintance with the structure and the vocabulary of the modern language. As one goes on with the study, and becomes acquainted with French literary artists, he realizes, more and more, the value of an understanding of the ways in which words have gained or lost or have been transfigured in meaning by the passage of the centuries. That is to say, he arrives at this realization, if he knows something of Latin. How pathetic is his condition if he has no consciousness of his loss! How shall he appreciate *Les Frères Ennemis* if he knows nothing of *The Seven against Thebes*, or *Andromaque* if he is ignorant of the *Iliad* or of the *Aeneid*? What does the *Britannicus* mean to the reader who has no first-hand acquaintance with Seneca or with the history of the Rome of the Caesars? Who can see even dimly the perfection of classic form in the works of Chénier, *Le Conte de Lisle*, or *De Hérédia*, if he knows not *Theocritus* or *Catullus*?

When one hears a class attempting to translate French poetry, how intensely he realizes how much of the meaning and the flavor is lost by the reader who has no faintest conception of the ways by which the present-day meanings of words have been distilled through passing seasons and centuries from the ancient vocables of Greece and Rome!

These things are, if possible, even more true of Spanish and Italian. Latin culture preserved its pristine vigor longer in Spain than elsewhere outside the Peninsula of its birth. Hence, despite the changes wrought by Goth and Saracen, the Spanish sentence preserves more nearly than another the sonorous periodicity of the tongue of Cicero.

Once upon a time students considered Italian and Spanish 'easy'. In those golden days, they came to the study of the Romance languages with some knowledge of Latin and sometimes even of Greek. Their successors of the present time are at a loss, not only in reading the lyric poets of the Renaissance, who began their every sonnet "to a mistress' eye-brow" with an obscure, but, as a rule, appropriate classical allusion. They discover the inner significance of the elder *De Hérédia's* *Ode to Niagara*, or of *Luaces's* *Cyrus Field and Hymn to Labor* only by dint of much thumbing of the classical dictionary, and of *Bullfinch's* *Age of Fable*, or *Gayley's* *Classic Myths*. For all Spanish literature drips classical allusions and references.

The student of Romance languages, becoming daily a more and more *rara avis* who has prolonged his

study of Latin sufficiently to have made acquaintance with Horace, and that still rarer creature who has read Lucretius, enjoys himself thoroughly and excites the wondering envy of his fellows by his effortless grasp of the meaning and his savoring of the aroma of the Spanish novelists, from *Lazarillo de Tormes* to the latest productions of Marmol, Ibañez, or Rizal, or of all the poets and the dramatists from *Cancionero del Cid* to the work of Galdos or the Quintero brothers.

If the modern student who considers Greek and Latin 'dead' languages finds the Spanish authors a succession of uncharted regions, what must be his fate when he joins battle with even the latest-born geniuses of the old Latin soil—Carducci, say, or the doughty *d'Annunzio*?

Nor are the classic references, allusions, echoes, and flavors the only difficulty which the present-day student finds in the Italian authors. These have always been conscious of their Roman heritage. Latin is to them merely an older form of their native tongue, in a deeper and more intimate sense than is Chaucerian English to the typical American College student. Consequently, when an Italian writer needs to express a shade of meaning not conveyed by any Italian word in common use, he modernizes the necessary Latin word by giving it the appropriate ending. And the bewildered American youth 'can't find it in the dictionary' and is at stale-mate.

The most determined advocate of the 'modern' and 'practical' in education needs to learn that he who would go far in Mathematics, Political Science, Sociology, Penology, or Psychology stops short of his best if he is not acquainted with the things the Italians have done in these and kindred subjects.

Our international relations are perhaps the subjects of most immediate and intimate concern to every thinking American who loves his country. We must, each and all, understand the problems, not only of South and Central America, but of Italy, Spain, the Balkans, and Japan, from the point of view of the intelligent natives of those countries. For an intelligent understanding of the problems of most of these countries through an acquaintance with their languages and literatures, we need far more classic lore than any but the most exceptional of our College students of to-day are acquiring.

Moreover, there is, in the present neglect of the thought and the expression of Greece and Rome, as well as of Palestine, a distinct loss of that intellectual and spiritual force which is the world's most imperative need. How shall we regain and hold, for the present and all time to come, this vanishing heritage?

GRINNELL, COLLEGE GRINNELL, IOWA CAROLINE SHELDON

REVIEWS

De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis. By John Raymond Crawford. Harvard University Dissertation. Printed in *Byzantinischer Zeitschrift* 23.3-4 (pages 365-396).

Dr. Crawford's thesis *De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis* covers thirty pages of subject-matter, in Latin, and a bibliography of two pages. The latter is equally divided between the ancient authorities (the original sources), and modern writers on the two festivals. It is not only the latest, but by far the most careful and searching investigation ever made of two festivals which are little known. Dr. Crawford's work is both a description of the celebrations and an effort to clear away the mists of obscurity and misunderstanding in which the festivals have long been shrouded. He has presented his subject chronologically, except in the chapter dealing with Lydus's account of the origins of the Brumalia. This method of presentation was, doubtless, better adapted to a detailed study of sources and secondary authorities, of which the thesis consists. Nevertheless, as it seems to me, a reviewer can secure greater clarity and render fuller justice to the author's purpose by abandoning the chronological order and turning at once to the Byzantine Brumalia and its problems.

From the beginning of the sixth century A. D. to the middle of the tenth, a festival, known as the Brumalia, flourished at Constantinople. It began on November 24 and continued until December 17; each of the twenty-four days thus included was designated by a letter of the Greek alphabet. During this festival it was customary for one to entertain each of his friends with a banquet on the day marked with that letter with which his name began.

Among other features of the festival, as we learn from Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158, was the slaying of a pig in December, a custom which belonged also to the ancient Roman Saturnalia. Moreover, the Byzantine Brumalia was actually called a festival of Cronos, and December 17, the day on which it closed, was the opening day of the Saturnalia. Forcellini and Cumont (the latter in *Revue de Philologie* 21, 149, n.2) regarded the Brumalia as identical with the Saturnalia. To this conclusion Forcellini was led by the fact that Martial (12.81) uses the words *Bruma* and *Saturnalia* interchangeably.

But Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158, in discussing the origins of the Brumalia, mentions the custom known as *ascolia*, which was a famous feature of the old Athenian Lesser Dionysia. Furthermore, the testimony of Canon 62 of the Council in Trullo, of the year 692 A. D.,¹ proves that there were certain Dionysiac rites lingering on in the seventh century of our era, and Balzamon, Tzetzes, and Zonaras, twelfth century Byzantine writers, affirm that the Brumalia was a festival of Dionysus, inasmuch as *βροῦμος* was an epithet of that god. It is a fact that at this festival, in the eighth century, the Emperor Constantine Copronymus revered Dionysus and Broumos as creators of corn and wine.

Hence Du Cange explained the Brumalia as a Roman festival in honor of Bacchus. A different view of the origin of the Brumalia is expressed by Ioannes Malalas, the sixth century Byzantine chronographer, an ex-

planation which, he says, he derived from the Roman annalist Licinius.

According to Malalas, Romulus instituted the Brumalia in order to relieve the opprobrium he had incurred in partaking of the food of his foster-father, Faustulus, for up to that time it had been deemed a disgrace to eat the bread of one not a blood relative. And so a festival was instituted at which every one was entertained by some one outside his family. This, says Malalas, was called, in the Latin tongue, *βρουμάλιον*; the entertainment took place on different days according to the position in the alphabet of the initial letter of one's name.

In considering this story of the origin of the Brumalia, Dr. Crawford, on page 371, revives and gives prominence to a half-forgotten theory of Tomaschek, first advanced in 1868, in *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften*, at Vienna, that the whole account is "Hirngespinnst eines Byzantiners". In the Licinius mentioned by Malalas Dr. Crawford recognizes, I think correctly, the Roman annalist Licinius Macer. He further recognizes in a fragment of the latter, preserved by Macrobius, the very passage on which Malalas drew. In my opinion the character of the passage hardly warrants this last conclusion, but the aetiological nature of Malalas's story, to which Dr. Crawford next draws attention, is unquestionable. The tale is obviously concocted to explain what Malalas and his imitators fancy to be the etymology of Brumalia, a word which Malalas renders once in this passage by *βρουμάλιον*, in support of his theory that Brumalia is derived from *βρῶμα*, 'food', and *alium*, in the sense of *alienum*.

Not only is Malalas's story of too aetiological a character to be worthy of credence, but Dr. Crawford emphasizes in particular the very different account of the origin of the festival which is given by Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158. This account, which scholars have heretofore neglected, Dr. Crawford makes it a primary aim of his thesis to subject to the most detailed examination, rendering to it the prominence and the weight to which it is entitled. Lydus differs altogether from Malalas, specifically stating that entertainment according to the letter of the alphabet with which a man's name began was of later growth. There is evidence that the alphabetical fashion of entertainment was in vogue in the reign of Justinian, and a little earlier, under Anastasius (491-518 A. D.), but there is no evidence before the close of the fifth century of entertainment according to the alphabet throughout a period of twenty-four days. It is true that Constantine Porphyrogenitus, writing in the tenth century, states that Constantine I, Theodosius I, Marcianus, and Leo I celebrated the Brumalia, but he does not mention the form or the duration of the festival under those Emperors.

Now, Tertullian and Cassianus Bassus (a Byzantine writer of the sixth or of the beginning of the seventh century) refer to an old Roman festival known as the Bruma, which occurred on November 24. This day, it must be remembered, was the day on which the

¹A misprint on page 385 dates this council in 632.

Byzantine Brumalia began. Mommsen, however, in C. I. L. 1², page 287, and Häbler, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, under *bruma*, make no distinction between this Bruma of Tertullian's time and the Byzantine twenty-four day festival, but ascribe to the Bruma the duration and the alphabetical plan of entertainment found in the Byzantine Brumalia. Yet Cassianus Bassus quotes Florentinus, a Roman author of the reign of Alexander Severus, and Didymus, a Greek of the fourth or the fifth century A. D., to the effect that the festival of the Bruma occurred on November 24.

Moreover, the calendars of Silviu and Philocalus, which date from the fourth and the fifth centuries respectively, both enter, under November 24, the name Bruma. Mommsen maintains that this entry does not refer to a festival day, but merely heralds the coming of the winter solstice, or true *bruma*, one month later. He understands the word as designating a period of time beginning November 24 and ending December 25, the day of the true *bruma*. He believes that Philocalus merely transferred from the end of this period of time to its beginning an epithet usually applied only to the end, and he quotes Pliny to the effect that the best writers designate the summer solstice by the word *solstitium*, the winter solstice by the word *bruma*. Bruma, then, under November 24 in Philocalus's calendar he understands as the first day of a period of that name, ending in the true *bruma*, or winter solstice, on December 25; and so the entry Bruma, he maintains, is balanced in this calendar against the entry Solstitium for June 24.

To this Dr. Crawford objects that, if Philocalus had intended to use the word Bruma as a parallel to Solstitium under June 24, he would have entered it under the day of the true *bruma*, not under November 24. He urges, moreover, that, had Philocalus been treating of a period of time, he would have noted not merely the beginning but the end as well, the day of the winter solstice, which, however, he omits altogether from his calendar. Silviu, on the other hand, has recorded both days in the words *solstitium et initium hiberni*, under December 25, and *Bruma*, under November 24. Had Silviu, says Dr. Crawford, intended by this entry to indicate not a festival but only an introductory day to the true *bruma*, he would not have designated the latter as *solstitium*, but would have employed the term *bruma* of both days.

In my opinion, it would be difficult to decide against Mommsen, were it not (1) for the passages cited above from Florentinus and Didymus; (2) for the testimony of Lydus, that the alphabetical mode of entertainment at the Brumalia was of later origin—evidence which Mommsen wholly ignores; and (3) for the aetiological nature of Malalas's account of the origin of the festival, which Mommsen fails to consider. In his first paragraph, Dr. Crawford states that two of his primary aims have been (1) to redirect the attention of scholars to the unreliability of Malalas, first pointed out by Tomaschek, in 1868, and (2) adequately to present and examine the passage in Lydus, which has hitherto

been overlooked, except in the incomplete and inaccurate treatment accorded to it by Cumont, *Revue De Philologie* 21, 149, note 2, and Trew, *ibidem*.

The result of Dr. Crawford's labors is convincing. He is the first to collect and weigh properly all the evidence concerning the festivals of the Bruma and the Brumalia. His conclusion is that there was an old Roman festival known as the Bruma², which preceded the true *bruma*, the winter solstice, by one month, and constituted a prelude or introduction to it; that this festival was held on November 24; that in the time of Constantine the Great and his earlier successors both this festival and the Saturnalia were probably celebrated independently at Constantinople, and that in the intervening period (between November 24 and December 17) certain of the rites of Dionysus and Demeter belonging to this season continued to be celebrated; that out of these three elements was evolved the Byzantine Brumalia, which derived its name from the initial one of the several ancient festivals of which it was composed, not from *βροῦμος* or *βρῶμα*, which are false etymologies invented by the Byzantine writers after the true origin of the Brumalia had been forgotten; that it was the coincidence of this festival's extent over twenty-four days, a number identical with that of the letters of the Greek alphabet, which led to the custom of entertaining at dinner in alphabetical order, and that the evidence at our disposal indicates that this custom did not arise before the close of the fifth century A. D., during the reign of Anastasius.

Finally, Dr. Crawford shows the error of Polites, and of Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, 226, in confusing the Brumalia with the New Year festival, which lasted down into the fifteenth century. There is no evidence, he says, to prove the existence of the Brumalia after the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, that is, the tenth century.

In addition to settling the principal problems which his subject presented, Dr. Crawford has disposed, in passing, of a number of minor problems, and has given a history of the celebration of the Brumalia in the various centuries of its existence.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY HORACE WETHERILL WRIGHT

The History of Religions. By E. Washburn Hopkins.
New York: The Macmillan Company (1918). Pp.
624. \$3.00.

Within the compass of this single volume Professor Hopkins has given a vast deal of information, well-ordered and clearly presented. Beginning with a couple of chapters on the definitions of religion, the sources from which our knowledge is derived, the classifications of religions, and the general characteristics of primitive religions, he discusses in turn a large number of religions, moving in general from the more primitive to the more advanced, thus ending his book

²This apparently did not antedate Martial, as that poet is ignorant of a festival of that name separate from the Saturnalia.